

1114

The Guildsman

Devoted to the Cause of a Corporative Order

A Year of Grace?

“ . . . Since 1789 ”

The Tragedy of Labor Unionism

The Pope Gives Hope

That FBI Investigation

“England is Aristocratic”

Hilaire Belloc's “Servile State”

January, 1943

To
Restore
All Things
in Christ



THE GUILDSMAN

Published Monthly, About the 15th, at Germantown, Illinois

Edward A. Koch, Editor and Publisher

Subscription: \$1.50 the Year, in Advance.

Single Copy, 15c

Vol. XI.

January, 1942

No. 4

A Year of Grace?

In religious circles it has been customary to refer to some year of the Christian era as "in the year of Grace so and so." The precise reason or origin of this phrase we do not know; probably no one does; nor does it matter much. It seems logical from the very nature of things that such a phrase should be formulated and used. Apart from the Redemption, and in fact as a sequel thereof, Grace—that is, special Heavenly favor and supernatural aid—is a distinctive mark of Christian times and Christian conditions. Therefore it is natural and proper that the years of the Christian era should be spoken of as years of Grace. This general applicability of that phrase to the entire Christian era and, speaking generally, to all persons and nations existing during it, however, has rather severe actual restrictions in the individual case. In other words, because a certain year is a year of the Christian era and therefore as such a year of Grace, it does not follow that it will be a year of Grace for every living person and for every nation. Or to put it yet otherwise, the present era and the present year are, as such, periods of Grace; but actual reception of Grace is dependent upon the condition of being free from grave moral fault; and the same holds true of nations, for nations as such may also be guilty of sin.

Now, at the beginning of the new year, the question is opportune: Will the new year be a year of Grace for our country? And that question is far more important than even the question of military victory; indeed, the very question of military victory—that is, a victory which would be an honor and not a disgrace to our country—is dependent

largely upon that other question, whether, for our country, the coming year will be a year of Grace. The decision of that question, as was just indicated, depends upon our nation's moral rectitude, upon freedom from grave moral fault, and that means, upon compliance with the Christian moral code. It is no secret that our country officially rejects or at least ignores the Christian moral law as the basic norm of conduct, and that in a number of serious matters, such as divorce, it directly violates that moral law. There may be added a reference to conditions of immorality, crime, greed, hate, injustice, and so forth, which are incompatible with the idea of a Christian nation. And as to the war, its case has not been so clearly vindicated as to exclude the possibility of injustice and of intentions of grabbing while repressing rightful claims of others. The dishonest and lying propaganda preceding and accompanying the war cast further reflections upon its character.

Much energy and wealth are being expended upon armaments & the training of military personnel for the sake of achieving a military victory, the precise objective of which is anything but clearly stated and therefore anything but clearly just and good. Is there not greater cause to be concerned about our nation's *moral status*, upon which will depend, whether the gravely decisive new year will be a year of Grace for our nation—that is, whether our country may rightfully expect special Heavenly favor and supernatural aid? The alternative would imply the likelihood of reprobation, of failure in the several fields, and of—chastisement.

“ . . . Since 1789 ”

Two words of our quotation, last month, from Monsignor Maeder's article make a fitting and timely theme for further comment. The Monsignor treated on the contempt, with which the modern world regards truly Christian conduct as revealed especially by that Christian idealism and heroism which upsets the world's standard of values, rates sacrifice in behalf of an ideal higher than a venal bargain or scramble for wealth or honors and disregards the world's favor as well as its disfavor. Such truly Christian conduct, Monsignor Maeder reminded us, the world considers as folly and insanity. And this state of affairs, he remarked incidentally, exists "since 1789," the time of the French Revolution, that is, since the time of the final termination of medieval conditions and the inauguration of that "liberty" which has formed the basis of subsequent political and social theory. So the modern world's standard of values and of conduct — which is a perversion of the Christian standard — and the world's contempt for things distinctly Christian and more particularly for the ideals of Christian perfection, originated with the formation of social and political principles which have prevailed since the French Revolution and which may be generally summarized under the name: Liberalism.

This leads inescapably to the conclusion that there is a direct and essential antithesis between the ideals of Liberalism and those of Christianity and that therefore under Liberalism — in spite of a certain tolerance of the Christian religion — Christianity cannot properly develop and mold public affairs or even the private lives of the people as it should. This conclusion has a direct and important bearing on the actual prevailing situation. It has a bearing, first of all, on the prospective development of the war, in this wise: Liberalism's standard of values, according to which money and honors are preferable to altruism and

sacrifice, is evidently baser and naturally less fruitful of results in the form of heroic action under trying circumstances of war than the Christian or even many a pagan standard; and therefore wherever Liberalism and its principles dominate and form the basis of conduct, the motive for or incentive to heroic deeds of self-sacrifice will be correspondingly weaker. But of yet greater interest is its bearing on or effect in the larger orbit of today's situation.

The din of war threatens neglect of an issue even more important than the war itself. Beside the war, but not unrelated thereto, there is the issue of impending, inevitable change of eras, as regards political and social conditions. Now, what bearing has the antithesis between Liberalism and Christianity on this coming change? The possible course of that change in this country is twofold: First, Capitalism — which is Liberalism in the economic field — may be gradually transformed into some form of extreme Socialism or Communism, through increasing government control (and eventually ownership) of industries — which would, of course, be accompanied by corresponding changes in social and political affairs. Such a change to what may be called moderate or extreme Communism would mean a retention of those features of Liberalism which account for its antithesis to Christianity. Therefore, in that case, the termination of Liberalism — which termination as such is inevitable, since Liberalism is the essence of the present system — would mean that it had been replaced by something worse as to its own character, and retaining the evil features of Liberalism which obstruct the proper influence of Christian ideals.

The alternative possibility — practically, the *eventual certainty* — will be a change to Corporatism; we mean *genuine* Corporatism, not a *counterfeit imitation* which would adopt the externals of cor-

porative structure but would in reality be a mere system of national cartels, retaining the essence of Capitalism—such is the recent proposal of British industrialists. Genuine Corporatism must be based on a Christian *concept of Society* and even more so on Christian *ideals*. Therefore the *ideals of Liberalism*, conflicting therewith, must first be abolished. That means that the process of change initiated by the French Revolution must be *reversed*. It means that the ideals and counsels of Christian perfection, which have been held in contempt since 1789, must be restored to a *place of honor*. And that means that the situation today is a repetition of the situation in the

early Christian centuries, when the anti-Christian ideals of pagan Rome were abolished and replaced by those of Christianity and thereby the foundations laid for the Christian civilization of the Middle Ages. The first stage of that great parallel achievement of the task of today consisted therein, that the military and political power of the Roman Empire was broken by the “barbarian” Germans; thereupon the Church could proceed to Christianize Europe. Such first-stage work in the undoing of the contemptible and impotent situation in which Christianity now finds itself, since 1789, we believe, is the mission of the “barbarian” Nazis and Fascists.

The Tragedy of Labor Unionism

Some timely thought on the subject of labor unionism was expressed in an article entitled “The Tragedy of Trade Unionism,” published in the Nov. 12 issue of the London “Weekly Review.” We are adopting its title, merely substituting the American equivalent: labor unionism for the English: trade unionism. The author, S. Sagar, was led to express his views on the subject by the publication of a book, “British Trade Unions” by Sir Walter Citrine, a British labor leader. In a general reference to the book in question we are told: “In spite of his modest manner, the author [Citrine] displays pride and a certain self-satisfaction in telling the story of Trade Unionism, from its struggle with the Combination Laws to its present position of political power. It is undoubtedly an achievement; but there is a temptation for a Trade Union leader to feel too proud and self-satisfied with that achievement.”

Why a temptation to feel too proud and self-satisfied? In answering this question, Sagar likewise offers his *reasons* for speaking of a *tragedy* of trade unionism. He raises the point: Are the achievements that have been made the things that the average workingman wanted or hoped for? and argues: “Trade

Unionism has had fifty years of triumph.” What has it done in those years to realize the dreams of John Smith who, let us say, was an average obscure member of a union in the nineties? Oh, I know you can make out a long list of the things it has done; but were they the things John Smith wanted done? Did he want salvation (assuming it has come) to come the way it has? Did he want bigger and bigger unions, with the ‘reps’ more & more remote from his control? Did he want old age pensions and compulsory insurance and a panel doctor? When I say, did he want, I mean: were these the things he hoped for, were they his vision of the things to come? The author [Citrine] says proudly, ‘it is unchallengeable’ that Health and Unemployment Insurance were founded on the experience gained by the unions in the Friendly Societies and self-help organizations. It never seems to occur to him to ask: Did John Smith want them to be founded? That is the question, and it is a question to which there can be only one answer. The average union member of the nineties was not inspired by any vision of State aid and its inevitable companion, State regulation. His idea was a wage that would leave him a margin. Some of them visualized using this margin to escape from

the factory, or at least to keep their children out of the factory. All of them visualized a margin that would enable them to provide for sickness & old age. Granted this, they would have been content to forego 'the palatial convalescent homes, sanatoria, rest house, holiday homes and similar institutions maintained by the unions themselves' and even 'the many remarkable improvements in social conditions which owe their inspiration to the unions.' In other words, John Smith wanted to be in a position to manage his own life. Have his leaders done much to help him to this desire? On the other hand, have they not, with their good intentions, paved the way for bureaucracy? That is the sad fact." In other words, that is the tragedy of the past course — which, generally, labor leaders here in America have also followed.

There is reference to two interesting facts related by Sir Walter, in his book. One concerns "the Statute of Laborers & Artificers, under which wage-fixing was the responsibility of the Justices of Peace" who "on the whole were disposed to deal fairly with the wage-earning class." The other recalls "labor" conditions before the day of unions, whose "necessity arose with the development of the factory system." Sir Walter, we are told, gives "a very pleasant picture of the England of the pre-Industrial Age" and is quoted as saying: "This picture of Britain before the face of the country was changed is not idyllic. There were dark shadows in the picture... But in this essential matter of the relations between employer and workpeople, with which the story of Trade Unionism is interwoven, the conditions under which domestic manufactures were carried on permitted a kindlier and more intimate personal contact to be maintained. Organization of trade and industry in the towns, where the guild spirit still survived from the 15th century, preserved these characteristics even after the system of domestic manufacture was superseded by factory production, following the application of steam power to mach-

inery and the disappearance of the handicrafts." Whereon Sagar comments: "This is true enough, but it is refreshing to find a modern Trade Union leader with the knowledge and imagination to see it."

Labor unions here as elsewhere are facing a changed future; it will be well to face that fact squarely. But a mere facing of that fact will not forestall disaster. The tragedy of the course indicated above is serious, and will become more serious if persisted in; greater evils still than those of the past may develop in the future. Due foresight and, above all, a sound and thorough understanding of the present situation and possible and probable developments will be essential on the part of labor leaders; and also a disposition to sacrifice some past gains and pet ideas and prejudices when the workers' welfare in the future will require it. So far there seems to be little evidence, that our labor leaders have grasped or accepted the idea that the rise of the Fascist regimes in Europe means the beginning of a new era and of the inauguration of a new system; nor do they seem as yet to understand the essentials of a guild or corporative order. That in itself is tragic.

—o—

To make the Russian alliance more palatable to our people, certain pro-Russian writers insist that Communism is *Democracy*, while others insist that the Russians are *abandoning* Communism. Taking both at their word, we arrive at the conclusion, that the Russians are *abandoning Democracy!*

—o—

William Agar (a virulent anti-German), while reviewing a new book in the "Commonweal" (Nov. 20), gives the following line-up of slogans in France and elsewhere: (French): "Rather Hitler than Leon Blum;" (Czechoslovak): "Better be conquered by Hitler than saved by Voroshilov;" and ("Tory American"): "Anything to get rid of Roosevelt." So he lines up Roosevelt with Communists.

The Pope Gives Hope

The Pope has spoken; and the world's prospects are better for it, even though some of his foes, especially his *secret* foes, may be gnashing their teeth over some of the things he said, and though many others may be displeased. Atheists and agnostics and others whose intellectual horizon does not extend beyond the material world—and there are many of these here among us—will not be greatly pleased therewith. And those who all these months sought to attribute the world's present woes to one man or to a few men, will be disappointed: for he clearly attributes them to the degeneracy and faults of men at large. Nor will those be particularly gratified who were and still are trying to present the fall of Poland as the beginning of the end of the world; the Pope unmistakably holds out hopes of a new and better future, albeit that its realization will require due knowledge, good-will and effort on the part of men in all lands. Those who seek to place the responsibility for the war upon Germany find no support for their case; that brightens the prospects for a just peace. Finally, those who desire a retention or revival of the capitalistic status quo, find themselves face to face with a weighty opponent, holding forth something better instead.

The war is not by any means passed over in silence; its horrors and cataclysmic character are duly noted. But those "patriots" among us who are now so enthusiastically glorifying war and everything that represents war, will find their enthusiasm chilled by the Pope's remark about freeing people from "the cruel nightmare of war." As to the character of and responsibility for the war the world was told: "[Our message is] an appeal to the conscience of the world and a rallying-cry to all those who are ready to ponder and weigh the grandeur of their mission and responsibility by the vastness of *this universal disaster*. A great part of mankind — and let Us not

shrink from saying it, not a few who call themselves Christians — have to some extent *their share* in the *collective responsibility* for the growth of error and for the harm and lack of moral fibre in the Society of today." And in another related passage: "[Due to] material and moral disintegration . . . the present upheaval . . . portrays all the terrifying lineaments of a *general judgement*." More specifically, the character and the source of the war as also the means for remedying the situation, are stated in these words: "What is this world war . . . but *the crumbling process . . . of a social order* which—behind a deceptive exterior or the mask of conventional shibboleths — hid its mortal weakness and its unbridled lust for gain or power? . . . Who can see the end of this progressive demoralization? Who can wish to watch this disastrous progress? Should men not rather, *over the ruins of a social order which has given such tragic proof of its ineptitude as a factor for the good of the people*, gather together the hearts of all those who are magnanimous and upright in the solemn vow not to rest until *in all peoples and in all nations* of the earth a vast legion shall be formed of those handfuls of men who—bent on bringing Society back to its center of gravity, which is the law of God — aspire to the service of the human person and of his common life ennobled in God?"

This reference to the law of God as the center of gravity or basis of human Society has its counterpart in critical references to the present state of "the juridic order" or human law. Thus: "Among such [presently prevailing, false] postulates We must count the juridical positivism, which attributes a deceptive majesty to the setting up of purely human laws, and which leaves the way open to the fatal divorce of law from morality." And further: "Anyone who considers with an open & penetrating mind the vital connection between social order

and a genuine juridical order, and who is conscious of the fact that the internal order in all its complexity depends on the predominance of spiritual forces, on the respect for human dignity in oneself and in others, on the love of Society and its God-given ends, cannot wonder at the sad effects of juridical conceptions which, far from the royal road of truth, proceed on the insecure ground of materialist postulates." And finally: "The juridic sense of today is often altered and perverted by the profession & practice of a positivism and a utilitarianism which are subjected and bound to the service of determined groups, classes & movements, whose programs direct and determine the course of legislation and the practice of the courts. The cure for this situation becomes feasible when we awaken again the consciousness of a juridical order resting on the supreme dominion of God and safeguarded from all human whims." This matter of legal reform has been given but little attention, except by a few such as ourselves; so many will be surprised that the Pope treats on it as an essential element of social reform. It is such; there can be no real reform of social conditions without corresponding *legal* reform. To a certain extent, conditions are changed first and then the laws are made to conform thereto. But the prevailing basic legal concepts are the foundation on which the existing social structure rests and correspondingly with which alone it can be essentially changed. Therefore, if the structure as such is in need of fundamental, essential change, as is the case today, the legal structure must change to the same extent. The Pope's insistence on this point gives ground for hope that it will be undertaken.

These points having been established, namely, that Capitalism has failed, and that the legal structure whereon it rests is due for corresponding change, there follows logically the rejection of an alternative, stated thus: "After the fateful economy of the past decades, during which the lives of all citizens were sub-

ordinated to the stimulus of gain, there now succeeds another and no less fateful policy which, while it considers everybody and everything with reference to the State, excludes all thought of ethics or religion." And logically related thereto is the insistence upon another matter: "The dignity of the human person requires normally and as a natural foundation of life, the right to the use of the goods of the earth. To this corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible, to all." Which implies a rejection of Communism, that is, government ownership of all means of production.

Rejection of these erroneous trends will be seen in the proper light, when read in connection with the following: "Security, reorganization, progressive improvement cannot be expected and cannot be brought about except by a return of large and influential sections to *correct notions about Society*. It is a return which calls for the Grace of God in large measure and for a resolute will, ready and prepared for sacrifice, on the part of good and far-seeing men. From these influential circles, who are more capable of penetrating and appreciating the beauty of just social norms, there will pass on and infiltrate into the masses the clear knowledge of the true, divine and spiritual origin of social life." Another point on this subject of procedure concerns the attitude toward such as have proceeded on wrong principles while their cause as such was just. To that case apply the words: "In spite of the fact that the ways they followed were and are false and to be condemned, what man, and especially what priest or Christian, could remain deaf to the cries that rise from the depths and call for justice and a spirit of brotherly collaboration in a world ruled by a just God?"

On such premises rest the encouraging statements concerning the future. There is, for instance, the remark embodying both gravity and hope, that "the stakes are the construction, nay the very soul of *the Society of tomorrow*." And the

the other: "The call of the moment is ... construction of *what is to arise* and must arise for the good of Society; ... the call now is to traverse the sea of errors of our day and to march on to free the holy land of the spirit, which is destined to sustain in its foundations the unchangeable norms and laws, on which *will arise* a social construction of solid internal consistency." And further: "We exhort you, not only to realize fully the dreadful gravity of this hour, but also ... to unite and collaborate toward *the renewal of Society*." And these hopes for a promising future are given a truly Christian character by the fact that the prospects of and labors for improvement are extended to embrace *others*; thus there is the noteworthy reference to "sacrifices necessary for social well-being in *other peoples*" — which anti-Germans, for instance, should note well.

In keeping with such virtual assurances of a better future, or at least of good prospects of achieving it, the Pope speaks of "this noble crusade for the cleansing and *renewal* of Society" and of "the new call for moral and Christian *rebirth*," and hopes for its success and prayer in its behalf are worded: "There are evident signs which go to show that, in the ferment of all prejudices and feelings of hate—those lamentable offspring of the war psychosis — there is still aflame in the peoples the consciousness of their mutual dependence for good or evil ... May this Christmas message of Ours, addressed to all those who are animated by a good will and a generous heart, encourage and increase the legions of those crusaders in every nation. And may God deign to give to their peaceful cause the victory, of which their noble enterprise is worthy." Truly inspiring and heartening words, particularly for such as ourselves and for the "handful" of friends who are so faithfully standing by us in these trying days. It is particularly heartening for us, and for our "handful" of supporters, that so much of what the Pope said tends to justify the course we have

followed. Surely, his unmistakable verdict concerning the doom of Capitalism, and his several indications of the character of the new order that should replace it, tend to confirm our theory that the situation today resembles the situation at the time of the Migration of Nations, when also a Capitalist Society met its doom and the foundations were laid for a new Christian Society, and that implies the other point of our theory, namely, that the "barbarians" (they are actually so called by the British) of today are in the role of the "barbarians" of that earlier period and have the same mission of overthrowing the doomed old order and preparing the foundations for the new.

—————o—————
Milton Mayer, himself a Jew, writing in the "Progressive" of Jan. 4, very strongly disapproves of the proposed formation of a Jewish Army to fight the Axis nations.

—————o—————
The "Catholic Digest" published an article by a British writer, the gist of which is given in the passage: "There was a sudden onset of armed maniacs about their *Fuehrer's* business, a flash of a bloody sword, and a deluge of young blood in the cradles." It is simply the story of the murder of the Innocents, but—not King Herod and his henchmen — *the Fuehrer* and *the Gestapo* are doing the murdering. Everyone knows, of course, who *the Fuehrer* and *the Gestapo* are, and everyone should know, why their names are substituted in this story of murder. Here is clear evidence of unscrupulousness of British propagandists who seize upon even sacred themes for the purpose of prejudicing the case of a political and commercial rival. Why, then, still believe all the stories about "persecution" in Germany, wherewith British sources so liberally provided us Americans and which many Catholic papers published for the due 'horrorification' of our Catholic people. The evil fruit thereof will appear in time. We may claim the credit of having fought it.

That FBI Investigation

About the time when our December issue was being prepared for publication, FBI men called at the bank where we have our "account" and elsewhere (but not here) to look into our affairs. So far as we have been able to learn, they, first, sought evidence that we receive money from the German Government or some such source; they found no evidence, of course, because there are no such funds. Secondly, it seems, they sought evidence that the articles we publish are written by, or revised by, some German agent or the like; again, they could find no evidence because there is nothing of the kind. Thirdly, it seems, they sought to class our writings as "subversive;" on that point may briefly be said this: If they mean: subversive of *evil* things, they can find plenty of evidence of *that* in our writings, but that evidently means doing *good*, and it does not seem to be the business of FBI men to investigate *good works*; but if they mean: subversive of *the welfare of our country*, they will find nothing to support their (rightful, excluding hysterical) fears or rather the contentions of *others* — for we believe they did not undertake the investigation on their own initiative but because someone *reported* us, like a *criminal*.

These several points may be taken up further. There is no need of saying anything more on the subject of German funds; the very idea is ridiculous. If the FBI men want further evidence that we are not getting big money, from anyone, they need but call here and see in what circumstances of privation we are living, must live, to be able to carry on, to be able to render this *good service* (it is such) *to our country* and to our Church. Neither the FBI men nor even the drafted soldiers are rendering *their* services for such meagre remuneration as we receive. Secondly, as to other contact with the German Government, it should suffice to say that, so far as we know, the German Government has not even the *least knowledge* thereof that we or our

publication *exist*; much less is there unlawful contact. These suspicions concerning dealings with an enemy government as also the third, concerning "subversive" activities, arise from a confusion of two entirely different things — from a confusion of two *attitudes* on our part, namely, our attitude toward the *presentation* here of Germany's case and our attitude toward *Germany itself*. In other words, because we have objected to certain *propaganda against* Germany and have sought to show that the facts in the case are *otherwise*, we were suspected of and accused of being *pro-German* in the sense of *anti-American*. The fact, however, is that not only our attitude or *motive*, but also our actual activities are decidedly *pro-American*. We hope, of course, as every true Christian should in such a case, that our labors may prove beneficial to peoples of *other* countries, including Germany, but our prime motive is to serve *our country's* welfare. Without such motive we would not bear the *sacrifices* involved.

This our contention, that our activities are meant to, and actually do, serve *our country's* welfare, will, of course, be denied by very many — the same very many who are ready to report us as "a Nazi", "a German agent" or the like. And these very many include members of the household of faith in varying degrees of prominence and bankers and industrialists and radicals and bigots and all those who swear by what "the paper" says. While all these very many are one in disagreeing with and opposing a policy such as ours, their *motives* for doing so differ greatly. Those members of faith's household are influenced almost exclusively by the stories about "religious persecution" or the like, and they believe *that* settles the question; it don't. Bankers and industrialists are motivated by "business interests" and believe *these* decide the question; they don't. Radicals of many hues oppose our policy primarily because the Nazis oppose their particu-

lar brand of radicalism; and for them *that* settles it. And the great mass of newspaper devotees, or rather newspaper slaves, are 'dead sure' of a thousand bad things about the Nazis because they read them in "the paper" and they will not stand for any disagreement or any suggestion that some of the things they read may not be true. Each of these several classes of the "very many" — who are our real opponents—has its own little ideological world, beyond which nothing of great value or importance is believed to exist; they are concerned with that little "welfare" of their own and identify that with the country's welfare. For this reason, their several ideologies and interests conflict; the religious enthusiast who is all "het up" about persecution does not share the banker's concern over foreign investments; the industrialist who dislikes the Nazis because they "upset the world of business" is cold toward the schemes of the radicals; and the newspaper slave, whose dislike and hatred of Nazis originates and changes with his newspaper's headlines and cartoons, is quite indifferent about the fate of religion. So the one disproves the position of the other; and all of them are thereby disqualified for deciding the case as such.

If *numbers* would decide the truth of such things, our case would be hopeless, still; the truth of things, however, is not decided on the basis of the number of those who vindicate or oppose; majority of votes does not decide here. So—having disposed of our very many opponents and their objections, we may return to our case. We opposed certain propaganda against Germany, which we had good reason to believe untrue or misleading or, in other cases, simply serving the purpose of provoking hate. Even in view of the war, we believe, such spreading of falsehood and provocation of hatred is undesirable. We can assume, that our country's cause in the war is just. Well, then, that justice of the cause would provide sufficient motive-ground for action and ample ground

for hope, that the just cause will win. Why, then, poison the minds and hearts of our people, with falsehood and hate, needlessly? It is worse than needless; that propaganda is very harmful; for it makes our people unfit, morally, intellectually, and psychologically, for the grave task awaiting it after the war. Was, then, our opposition thereto not a case of serving our country's welfare? Secondly, we have sought to emphasize the *social reform* factor inherent in Nazism and Fascism — which others completely ignore. Due to the fact (clearly proven on other pages of this issue) that Capitalism is doomed and something new must be put in its place, due consideration of that feature of those European regimes is of great value for assuring our country's future welfare. So, again, we are serving our country's welfare. These points give the substance of our "crime." Now, if our "crime" really means serving the *welfare* of our country, then those who *oppose* our work are engaged in activities *subversive* of our country's welfare; therefore *they*, and not *we*, are proper subjects for an FBI investigation.

—o—

Those people who are so "American" as to hate all other peoples, are not the kind to follow.

The Pope at least has words of appreciation for the "crusader volunteers for a new Society." Which should lead others to support work like ours.

Bishop Boyle of Pittsburgh stated recently: "Consider for a moment that ... 'society,' so called, tends to die out; it's the 'cultured' and the rich who disappear. And from the very bottom come the people who constitute the other strata above the lowest one. It is a certain something in the lower strata that has preserved Society." We believe that to hold good, not only of individuals within a nation, but also of nations themselves which bear those characteristics, and may therefore be said to apply in the case: "Aristocratic England vs. "barbarian" Germany.

FIELD MARKERS

"England is Aristocratic"

American readers of the "Weekly Review" who may still believe that the Allies are fighting for the sacred cause of Democracy, will have been shocked by the tenor of the article on "The Aristocratic State" in its issue of Nov. 12. The article starts right out with: "England is the last Aristocratic State in the old world. Those who know the East tell us that Japan is another. We do not know much about Japanese conditions, but at any rate we know all about English conditions, and of English conditions we may say without hesitation that they are the conditions of an Aristocratic State." And then immediately explains what is meant by the latter term: "One means by an Aristocratic State a State controlled by a governing class, naturally, and as a matter of course. . . . It means a State which has inherited and naturally continues the political habit of class government, not, of course, imposed, but taken for granted as a common and universal political habit. Such a State is Modern England." Class government is not necessarily wrong, assuming that the governing class is properly disposed, even though to Americans the idea is anathema. It has certain advantages; on that point we are told: "The advantages enjoyed by the Aristocratic State are very great, and those advantages are recognized at once by rivals upon every side. These advantages are political and their chief mark is homogeneity." Is that perhaps the reason, why there was so much objection in England to the Nazi innovation of establishing a sort of governing class? But there are also disadvantages; on that score we are told: "The marks of decline in an Aristocratic State are not a loss of power in the governing class, still less a dilution of that class, but the loss in general opinion of the

special position enjoyed by the governing class. . . . The thing is known by a sort of taste or savor, in the absence of which (still more in the dissipation of which), when once it has been established, the mortal disease of that leading moulding formative governing tone is apparent, and when this disease is apparent you may safely predict the end of what had hitherto been an Aristocratic State." It would seem that the principles or policy guiding it is even more decisive for the fortunes of such a class than "accent of speech" and "tone." The author of the article mentioned is Hilaire Belloc, author of "The Servile State," quoted on these pages. This coincidence suggests the thought: Is not a good portion of Englands' aristocracy that class of land-owners which insisted on having some of the confiscated Church properties, and what, then, is the character and likely future of that aristocracy?

Hilaire Belloc's "Servile State"

Today, when the world is in the throes of social and political rebirth (whereof the war is largely an accompanying phenomenon), and when there is much disturbing talk of an impending "slave world," it is of interest to recall essential passages of Hilaire Belloc's work, "The Servile State." In one of the earlier chapters of the book, the author gives his definition or explanation of Capitalism, which must be known to understand his argument concerning the Servile State. That explanation of Capitalism reads: "A Society in which private property in land and capital, that is, the ownership and therefore the control of the means of production, is confined to some number of free citizens not large enough to determine the social mass of the State, while the rest have not such property and are therefore proletarian, we call Capitalist; and the method by which

wealth is produced in such a society can only be the application of labor (the determining mass of which must necessarily be proletarian) to land and capital in such fashion that, of the total wealth produced, the Proletariat which labors shall receive only a portion." (p.15) The Servile State is defined: "That arrangement of society, in which so considerable a number of the families and individuals are constrained by positive law to labor for the advantage of other families and individuals, as to stamp the whole community with the mark of such labor, we call the Servile State." (p. 16) A little later the process of establishing the latter is briefly indicated: "From a purely Servile conception of production and of the arrangement of society, we Europeans sprang. The Immemorial past of Europe is a Servile past. During some centuries, which the Church raised, permeated and constructed, Europe was gradually released or divorced from this immemorial and fundamental conception of slavery. To that conception, to that institution, our Industrial or Capitalist society is now upon its return. We are re-establishing the slave." (p.27) This point is clarified by a comparison of medieval with modern conditions: "That excellent consummation of society [in the Middle Ages, in which "slavery had gone, and in its place had come that establishment of free possession which seemed so normal to men and so consonant to a happy human life"] passed, as we know, and was in certain provinces of Europe, and more particularly in Britain destroyed. For a Society, in which the determinant mass of families were owners of capital and land, for one in which production was regulated by self-governing corporations of small owners, for one in which the misery and insecurity of a proletariat was unknown, there came to be substituted the dreadful moral anarchy against which all moral effort is now turned, and which goes by the name Capital-

ism." (p.52) England's special contribution toward that change for the worse is indicated, first, by these words: "It was in England that the Industrial System arose. It was in England that all its traditions and habits were formed; and because the England in which it arose was already a Capitalist England, modern Industrialism, wherever you see it at work today, having spread from England, has proceeded upon the Capitalist model." (p. 69) And by the following: "Had Henry VIII and his successors kept the [Church] lands thus confiscated . . . [the course of affairs would have been different]. The king failed to keep the lands he had seized. That class of large land-owners, which already existed and controlled anything from a quarter to a third of the agricultural values of England, were too strong for the monarchy. They insisted upon land being granted to themselves, and they were strong enough in Parliament and through the local administrative powers they had, to see that their demands were satisfied." (p.63-4) Finally, the interesting passage: "The Collectivist [i.e. Communist] experiment is thoroughly suited to the Capitalist Society it proposes to replace. . . This picture of the natural transition from Capitalism to Collectivism seems so obvious that many Collectivists in a generation immediately past believed nothing stood between them and the realization of their ideal save the unintelligence of mankind. . . It is becoming increasingly certain, that the attempted transformation of Capitalism into Collectivism is resulting, not in Collectivism at all, but in . . . the Servile State." (p.112-115) Therefore, servile or slave conditions threaten to develop from Capitalism, via Communist ideology, and not from Nazism or Fascism.

The Pope's Christmas address gives little comfort to those who single out the Nazis for condemnation.

PROVOCATIVES

Recommend "The Guildsman" to your friends.

Evidently, the Pope favors neither a restoration of Capitalism nor Communism. What then but Corporatism?

The courts in our country no longer quarrel about the lawfulness of divorce; they now quarrel about recognizing one another's divorces, which in the final analysis is probably a quarrel over fees.

The Jesuit "America" has severely criticized the latest speech by General Franco, and the "Commonweal" has applauded. Do American Catholics wish to contribute to the overthrow of Franco and re-establishment of the "Loyalist" regime in Spain?

President Roosevelt declared the Darlan assassination to be "murder of the first degree" and added: "Nazism, Fascism and military despotism [which means Japan] hold otherwise." But—he said not a word about Communism, whose murders in Russia and Spain he should not have yet forgotten.

The Danish "Kritisk Ugerevue" has editorially characterized British propaganda in Denmark in such terms as these: "To be pro-English means [according to that propaganda] being Danish and to be pro-German means being un-Danish. . . . To forsake Finland's cause means to fight for the 'Union of the North,' and from the pulpit to sow hatred in peoples' hearts means to serve the Kingdom of God."

George Barnard, London correspondent for the N.C.W.C. News Service, wrote recently with a certain feeling of gratification that "never in history have there been so many kings and queens in Britain with their ministers, conducting their affairs from London." Which will hardly evoke great enthusiasm here. And England has all the while been insisting that Germany, France, Spain, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and so forth, must be republics!

Victory for an evil or unworthy purpose will mean defeat.

Fred Hayward, president of the British Co-operative Union, has also endorsed the proposed State monopoly of education in England.

In his Christmas address, the Pope repeats the Church's condemnation of "the various forms of Marxist Socialism," but he does not mention Nazism or Fascism.

Even an occasional reading of the "Socialist Standard," the "official organ of the Socialist Party of England," suffices to convey the conviction that real Socialists reject Nazism, and that therefore Nazism evidently is not Socialism, in the proper sense.

Speaking on Russia in Chicago recently, Charles Chaplain stated without reserve: "Russia is fighting for Communism." And the "Detroit Free Press" agreed therewith, and added that the Russians are capable of great sacrifice for their faith, "whether in the God of their fathers or in the political-religious god of their new economic order." So, if Russia should win in the war, what may be expected?

Students of the Jewish question will do well to weigh editorial comment in the London "Weekly Review" (Nov. 5) on Wendell Willkie's proposal that a "home for the Jews" be established in Palestine. The "Review" insists, first of all, that the so-called Balfour Declaration (embodying in substance the same proposal) should more accurately be called "the Rothschild-cum-Weissmann Declaration" and, secondly, that the partial carrying out of that Declaration, in permitting "Jews from all over Europe to overrun Palestine" brought "unrest and the worst type of big business" to that country. Was not such the case also in Germany and elsewhere and the cause of "anti-Semitism"?

THE GUILDSMAN

champions a new social order on the basis of the guild idea, an essential feature of which is that employer and employee belong in the same organization, sharing equitably the proceeds of their labor, and jointly striving to promote the common good.

Guildsman Publications

In Furtherance of the New Social Order

"PETER'S ANSWER"

A short story, easily understood, with pointers toward the character of the proposed new order. Intended for distribution among the people.

5 Cents a Copy

50 for \$2.00

"The Local Industrial Guild"

A sketch of present conditions and means now employed for improvement, concluding with the proposal of local industrial guilds, a "beginning anew," as the proper means.

10 Cents a Copy

50 for \$3.50

NEW YEARS are invariably greeted with enthusiasm frequently of the carnival type or even worse, while the old year is left to depart without even a thought of gratitude for the good things it brought. This disposition accounts for the expectation of great and good things in the new year and for the absolute indifference toward things of the past, which frequently, and especially today, must provide the basis for the good things to come.

The Editor-Publisher.

*Save
America
Through a
Corporative
Order*